



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name

MEMORIAL HERMANN HOSPITAL SYSTEM

Respondent Name

AMERICAN CASUALTY CO OF READING PA

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-09-3664-01

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 47

MFDR Date Received

NOVEMBER 26, 2008

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated November 25, 2008: "The patient was admitted to Memorial Hermann Hospital by Dr. Mohammad Etminan to perform a complicated spinal fusion due to complications arising out of his original on-the-job injury of July 21, 2006...Because the hospital's usual and customary charges exceeded the stop loss threshold, payment should have been made at 75% of total charges."

Amount in Dispute: \$30,472.10

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated December 22, 2008: "as can be seen from the attached BRC Report and CCH setting, there is currently an extent of injury dispute directly related to the treatment for which fees are currently being sought by the provider."

Response Submitted by: J. Diamond and Associates, PLLC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
November 27, 2007 through November 30, 2007	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$30,472.10	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to requests filed on or after January 15, 2007, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee

guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- 16-Claim service lacks information which is needed for adjudication. At least one Remark Code must be provided (may be comprised of either the Remittance Advice Remark Code or NCPDP Reject Reason Code).
- 855-022-Charge denied due to lack of sufficient documentation of services rendered.
- 44-Prompt pay discount.
- 850-500-Any network reduction is applied per agreement between the provider and the above referenced network.
- 45-Charge exceeds fee schedule/maximum allowable or contracted/legislated fee arrangement.
- 900-021-Any network reduction is in accordance with the network referenced above.
- W1-Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
- 400-001-The inpatient reimbursement has been based on per diem, stoploss factor or billed charges whichever is less.
- W3-Additional payment made on appeal/reconsideration.
- 920-010-Upon receipt of a requested report, the recommended allowance has been adjusted.
- W4-No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.
- 920-002-In response to provider inquiry, we have re-analyzed this bill and arrived at the same recommended allowance.

Issues

1. Does a compensability/extent of injury issue exist in this dispute?
2. Does a contractual agreement issue exist in this dispute?
3. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
4. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
5. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
6. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. The respondent raises the issue of compensability/extent of injury in the position summary. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(B) states "The response shall address only those denial reasons presented to the requestor prior to the date the request for MDR was filed with the Division and the other party. Any new denial reasons or defenses raised shall not be considered in the review. If the response includes unresolved issues of compensability, extent of injury, liability, or medical necessity, the request for MDR will be dismissed in accordance with subsection (e)(3)(G) or (H) of this section." A review of the submitted

explanation of benefits does not support the respondent denied reimbursement for the disputed services based upon compensability/extent of injury; therefore, the issue of compensability/extent of injury will not be considered further in the review.

2. According to the explanation of benefits, the carrier paid the services in dispute in accordance with a contracted or legislated fee arrangement. The "Network Reductions" amount on the submitted explanation of benefits denotes a "0.00" discount. The Division finds that documentation does not support that the services were discounted due to a contract; therefore, reimbursement for the services will be reviewed in accordance with applicable Division rules and guidelines.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore, the audited charges equal \$72,266.00. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that "This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission." The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion states that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services" and further states that "...independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases." The requestor in its position statement states that "Because the hospital's usual and customary charges exceeded the stop loss threshold, payment should have been made at 75% of total charges." This position does not meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor presumes that the disputed services meet Stop-Loss, thereby presuming that the admission was unusually extensive. The requestor's position failed to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor does not demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive compared to similar surgery services or admissions. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).
5. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. The requestor's position statement did not demonstrate how this inpatient admission was unusually costly. The requestor does not provide a reasonable comparison between the cost associated with this admission when compared to similar surgery services or admissions, thereby failing to demonstrate that the admission in dispute was unusually costly. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
6. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." The length of stay was three days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of three days results in an allowable amount of \$3,354.00.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)."
 - A review of the submitted medical bill indicates that the requestor billed revenue code 278 for Implants at \$43,083.75. Review of the medical documentation provided finds that although the requestor billed items under revenue code 278, no invoices were found to support the cost of the implantables billed. For that reason, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the

submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$364.75/unit for Thrombin 5MU. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these pharmaceuticals. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$3,354.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$23,727.40. Based upon the documentation submitted no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

_____	_____	01/29/2015
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.